Filed: 04/27/2001

Group Art Unit: 1648

REMARKS

Applicants have carefully studied the Final Office Action mailed on May 5, 2004, which

issued in connection with the above-identified application, and thank the Examiner and his

Supervisor for the courtesy of considering a proposed amendment to the claims (discussed

below). The present amendments and remarks are intended to be fully responsive to all points of

rejection raised by the Examiner and are believed to place the claims in condition for allowance.

Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present claims are respectfully requested.

**Pending Claims** 

Claims 2-5, 7-17, 19-29, 32, 39, and 42-45 are pending and at issue in the application.

Claims 2-5, 7-14, 42, and 43 have been temporarily withdrawn from consideration, but, as

specified at page 2 of the previous Office Action dated August 12, 2003 (paper 20), could be

rejoined with claims under examination upon determination of the allowable subject matter.

Claims 29-32 and 39 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being

indefinite. Claims 15-17, 19-30, 32, 39, and 44 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as

being obvious over the prior art.

Claims 29, 32 and 39 have been amended to correct formal defects. Applicants gratefully

acknowledge the courtesy shown by the Examiner and the Examiner's Supervisor in reviewing

the amendments to claims 29, 32 and 39 in an informal communication on September 1 and

September 7, 2004. No new subject matter has been added as a result of these amendments, no

new search is required, and no new issues are raised.

In the Office Action Summary, the Examiner states that claims 2-17, 19-29, and 45 are pending. Applicants respectfully note that claims 1, 6, 18, 30-31, 33-38, and 40-41 have been canceled in previous amendments, while

claims 2-5, 7-17, 19-29, 32, 39, and 42-45 are pending.

9

Docket No.: 02427/100G772-US1

Filed: 04/27/2001

Group Art Unit: 1648

35 U.S.C. §112, Second Paragraph, Rejections

In the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected claims 29-32 and 39 under 35 U.S.C.

§112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for lack of active method steps that result in the

production of infectious virus.

As claims 30-31 have been canceled, the rejection of these claims is rendered moot.

Claims 29, 32 and 39 have been amended to explicitly recite the results of practicing the

method. The Examiner and the Examiner's Supervisor approved this amendment in an informal

communication on September 1 and September 7, 2004.

In light of the foregoing, the rejection of the claims based upon 35 U.S.C. §112, second

paragraph, is believed to be overcome and withdrawal of such is kindly requested.

35 U.S.C. §103(a) Rejections

In the Office Action, the Examiner has maintained the rejection of claims 15-17, 19-30,

32, 39, and 44 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Hoffmann dissertation (1997) and

Neumann et al. (Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci., 1999, 96: 9345-50) and has rejected claim 45 as being

obvious over Hoffmann and Neumann et al. and further in view of Pleshka et al. (J. Virol., 1996,

70: 4188-92). The Examiner contends that, knowing that Neumann et al. generated infectious

influenza virus by a plasmid-based system and the benefit of adding more protein expressing

plasmids to the transfection and knowing that multi-plasmid transfections are complex, one of

ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would be motivated to use the plasmid of

Hoffmann to reduce the number of plasmids required to transfect and save time in cloning with

the expectation of success, because the promoter elements used by Hoffmann are the same as

used by Neumann et al.

As claim 30 has been canceled, the rejection of this claim is rendered moot. With respect

to the remaining claims, the rejection is respectfully traversed for the reasons provided below.

10

Docket No.: 02427/100G772-US1

Filed: 04/27/2001

Group Art Unit: 1648

The present claims call for a set of dual promoter pol I-pol II plasmids (each comprising

one influenza viral genomic segment). This set of plasmids, when co-introduced into a host cell

in the absence of any helper virus or additional viral protein-expressing plasmids, produce an

infectious influenza virus.<sup>2</sup>

As specified in the attached Expert Opinion Declarations of Dr. Robert G. Webster

(Exhibit A, section 15) and Dr. Richard J. Webby (Exhibit B, section 9), the Hoffmann

dissertation describes single pol I-pol II plasmids carrying heterologous reporter genes such as

CAT and GFP. The Hoffmann dissertation does not disclose or suggest making even a single pol

I-pol II plasmid encoding a viral gene segment, or that such a single plasmid would work in the

context of influenza virus rescue, much less a full set of such plasmids capable of reconstituting

an infectious influenza virus in the absence of a helper virus. The Hoffmann dissertation

discloses transcription of a single reporter mRNA and expression of a reporter protein using host

cell transcription/translation machinery and replication of a single reporter RNA in the presence

of viral polymerase proteins supplied by a helper virus (FPV, pp. 114-115). Such disclosure

does not provide any teaching or suggestion or a reasonable expectation of success that eight

influenza viral RNAs can be transcribed/replicated using dual promoter pol I-pol II plasmids to

achieve generation of an infectious viral particle. Indeed, as Dr. Webby states in section 9 of his

Expert Opinion Declaration:

The pol I-pol II reporter gene construct described in the Hoffmann thesis is an

interesting curiosity. However, even if one were to extrapolate from this construct to a construct with a viral gene instead of a reporter gene, there remain vast uncertainties as to whether the expression of vRNA and mRNA from that construct would yield functional RNA molecules. To then leap to the 8-plasmid

dual pol I-pol II promoter system of the present invention goes orders of magnitude beyond what the Hoffmann dissertation actually teaches or suggests.

Each of the 8 dual promoter plasmid constructs introduces a degree of

uncertainty, further compounded when one omits a helper virus.

<sup>2</sup> Claims are pending, albeit withdrawn, directed to each individual construct.

11

Filed: 04/27/2001

Group Art Unit: 1648

The Neumann *et al.* article does not teach the pol I-pol II dual promoter plasmids, but teaches separate pol I-only and pol II-only plasmids. Nothing in Neumann suggests the desirability of substituting the pol I-only and pol II-only plasmids for Hoffmann's pol I-pol II dual promoter plasmids, nor does anything in Hoffmann provide a basis for using the pol I-pol II plasmids in the Neumann plasmid-based system for generation an infectious influenza virus.

As specified in detail in the attached Expert Opinion Declarations of Dr. Webster (section 13) and Dr. Webby (sections 11 and 13), the separation of pol I and pol II promoters on different plasmids lies at the very core of the Neumann *et al.* plasmid system as this system attempts to recapitulate the life cycle of an influenza virus by allowing regulation of viral protein expression separately from viral genome segment replication. In fact, in its most efficient (high yield) versions, the system of Neumann *et al.* uses, in addition to protein expression (pol II) plasmids encoding PB1, PB2, PA, and NP influenza proteins, extra protein expression plasmids encoding HA, NA, M1, M2, and NS2 proteins (making the total desirable number of transfected plasmids 17 instead of 12; see, p. 9347 [¶ bridging left and right col.] and Table 1 at p. 9348 of Neumann *et al.*). Based on this disclosure, a person skilled in the art would be persuaded to increase, not to decrease, the number of plasmids in a plasmid-based influenza expression system. The optimal use of the reverse genetic system disclosed in Neumann *et al.* also relies on the ability to provide specified amounts of each viral protein by transfecting different amounts of each of the protein expression (pol II) plasmids (see, *e.g.*, p. 9347 left col., ¶¶ 3-4 of Neumann *et al.*).

In contrast to Neumann *et al.*, the reverse genetic system of the present invention contains fewer plasmids (*e.g.*, eight for influenza A virus) which can be transfected in roughly equal amounts (see, *e.g.*, p. 72, ll. 11-12 of the present specification). Most importantly, the dual pol I-pol II promoter reverse genetic system of the present invention is based on a different principle of coordination of viral replication and protein expression as compared to the single promoter plasmid system of Neumann *et al.* In the dual pol I-pol II promoter system of the present invention, the vRNA/cRNA and mRNA syntheses occur from the same plasmid and cannot be

12

Docket No.: 02427/100G772-US1 {W:\02427\100G772000\00294702.DOC \*02427\00G772000\* }

Group Art Unit: 1648

separately controlled. This creates additional spatial and temporal hurdles for regulation of

transcription and replication, which are not present either in the Neumann et al. system or in

nature. As specified in section 14 of the Expert Opinion Declaration of Dr. Webby, such spatial

and temporal hurdles stem, for example, from the fact that pol I-mediated transcription

(vRNA/cRNA synthesis) takes place in the nucleolus, while pol II-mediated transcription

(mRNA synthesis) takes place in a different site in the nucleus. Since, at the time of the

invention, it was not known whether mRNA and vRNA/cRNA syntheses occur on pol I-pol II

plasmids at the same time, the ability of these plasmids to produce both mRNA and

vRNA/cRNA appeared uncertain. Also, it appeared uncertain that pol I- and pol II-directed

transcription (involving assembly of huge molecular complexes and conformational changes of

the template) can occur successfully on the same artificial construct in the absence of natural

viral regulatory mechanisms. Indeed, mRNA transcripts derived from pol I-pol II plasmids

contain pol I promoter and terminator sequences in their 5' and 3' non-coding regions. These

sequences (not present in the Neumann et al. system) are sites where pol I transcription and

termination factors bind. One could therefore envision that binding of these factors to pol I

promoter and terminator regions in the pol I-pol II plasmids may result in reduction in pol II-

mediated transcription. The interaction of pol I promoter and terminator sequences with

influenza sequences in mRNA derived from pol I-pol II plasmids was also unpredictable at the

time of the invention and one could envision that it could possibly affect mRNA stability and

translation efficiency leading to a lower abundance of some or all mRNAs. Neither Neumann et

al. nor the Hoffmann dissertation provide any suggestion that such spatial and temporal hurdles

for regulation of transcription and replication can be overcome with respect to each viral segment

and result in the production of an infectious virus.

Indeed, as specified in the attached Expert Opinion Declarations of Dr. Webster (sections

14 and 16) and Dr. Webby (section 14), having a complete knowledge of the Neumann et al.

reference and the Hoffmann dissertation, leading scientists in the field were highly skeptical that

13

Docket No.: 02427/100G772-US1

Group Art Unit: 1648

the dual pol I-pol II promoter plasmid system of the present invention can produce an infectious

virus. Thus, Dr. Webster, a leading world expert in the field of influenza virology, states in

section 14 of his Declaration that "when Dr. Hoffmann came up with the idea of the dual pol I-

pol II promoter system, everyone in the laboratory, including myself, was very skeptical that

such a system could produce an infectious virus". Similarly, Dr. Webby concludes section 14 of

his Declaration by stating that "the success of the present invention came as a great surprise".

Taken together, neither the Hoffmann dissertation nor Neumann et al. article provide any

expectation of success, much less any motivation to be combined with the other reference or to

modify the disclosed compositions. These references in combination do not in any way suggest

a dual promoter pol I-pol II plasmid encoding an influenza viral gene segment, much less the

claimed composition of a set of dual promoter pol I-pol II plasmids for the generation of

infectious influenza viruses from cloned viral cDNA as recited in the present claims. As Dr.

Webby states in section 17 of his Declaration, "there was no way to know whether the pol I-pol

II plasmid approach of the present invention would work, until Dr. Hoffmann showed that it

worked". As further specified in section 19 of the Declaration of Dr. Webster

[T]he present invention represents a significant breakthrough both in the field of basic virology of negative stranded RNA viruses and in the field of influenza

vaccine production. I strongly disagree with the Examiner's conclusion that the

present invention is obvious over the Hoffmann dissertation and Neumann et al.

article. Perhaps viewed from the vantage of Dr. Hoffmann's success it seems obvious to introduce the viral gene segments into pol I-pol II dual promoter

obvious to introduce the viral gene segments into pol I-pol II dual promoter plasmids. However, none of us - including myself, one of the leading experts in

influenza in the world, thought so at the time... It took extraordinary vision to employ the dual pol I-pol II promoter system for all of the viral segments. In my

view, such vision, and the results obtained, are the antithesis of obviousness.

The only conclusion one can come to in view of the opinion of Drs. Webster and Webby,

two leading world experts in the field of influenza virology and recombinant vaccines whose

Expert Opinion Declarations are attached to this Response, is that the present invention is not

obvious over the cited prior art. Affidavits of those skilled in the art have been held to constitute

14

Docket No.: 02427/100G772-US1

Filed: 04/27/2001

Group Art Unit: 1648

factual evidence of the level of skill in the art. E.g., In re Piasecki, 223 U.S.P.Q. at 789; In re

Oelrich, 198 U.S.P.Q. 210, 214-15. Such affidavits constitute competent evidence that cannot be

ignored. See e.g., Ashland Oil, Inc. v. Delta Resins & Refractories, Inc., 227 U.S.P.Q. 657, 674-

75 (Fed. Cir. 1985). Only an improper hindsight reconstruction could rebut the experts' position.

It is well settled however, that such hindsight reconstruction is an error.<sup>3</sup>

The absence of a motivation to combine the Neumann et al. and Hoffmann references

and the absence of obviousness to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the present

application was filed also follows from the following additional disclosures.

Fodor et al., J. Virol., 1999, 73: 9679-9682 (cited in the Information Disclosure

Statement). This article was published almost simultaneously with Neumann et al. and reported

a similar approach in which influenza virus was generated by cloning cDNAs encoding vRNAs

under the control of the human RNA pol I promoter. The hepatitis delta virus ribozyme was

used to generate the 3' ends of the viral transcripts. Transfection of the pol I/ribozyme plasmids

into mammalian cells, together with protein expression plasmids for the polymerase and NP

proteins, yielded infectious virus.

Similarly to Neumann et al., Fodor et al. used, in addition to vRNA-encoding plasmids,

viral protein expression plasmids. In contrast to Neumann et al., when discussing at the end of

the article how to improve the efficiency of viral rescue in their recombinant system, Fodor et al.

acknowledge that reduction of the number of plasmids may be useful. However, in contrast to

the present invention, they suggest to reduce the number of plasmids not by creating pol I-pol II

dual promoter constructs but by creating cell lines stably expressing essential proteins for

encapsidation, transcription, and replication of viral genomic RNA (PB1, PB2, PA, and NP) (see

p. 9681, left col., ¶ 2).

<sup>3</sup> In re Dow Chemical Co., 5 USPQ2d 1529, 1532 (Fed. Cir. 1988); In re Fritch, 23 USPQ2d 1780, 1784 (Fed. Cir. 1992); W.L. Gore & Assocs., Inc. v. Garlock, Inc., 721 F.2d 1540, 1552 (Fed. Cir. 1983); Ex parte Obukowicz, 27

USPQ2d 1063 (BPAI 1993).

15

Docket No.: 02427/100G772-US1

Serial No.: 09/844,517 Filed: 04/27/2001 Group Art Unit: 1648

The authors of Fodor *et al.* published their articles in 1999 and were among the leaders in the field of recombinant generation of influenza viruses. While they may have recognized the importance of reducing the number of plasmids to increase the efficiency of viral rescue, they were still not able to appreciate the usefulness of the dual promoter pol I-pol II plasmid disclosed in the Hoffmann dissertation (1997) to solve the problem of reducing the number of plasmids. Clearly, a person of average skill in the art would be even less able or motivated to do so.

Neumann and Kawaoka, Rev. Med. Virol., 2002, 12: 13-30 (attached as Exhibit C). This is a recent review by the two senior authors of the Neumann *et al.* article in which they state as follows (p. 22, ¶ bridging left and right col.; emphasis added):

The RNA polymerase I system for the generation of influenza A virus requires the cotransfection of 12-17 plasmids and may limit the efficient generation of virus to cell lines that can be transfected with high efficiencies. To reduce the number of plasmids, Hoffmann et al. explored a different route, cloning cDNA encoding vRNA in positive orientation between an RNA polymerase II promoter derived from cytomegalovirus and a polyadenylation signal. They inserted this cassette in negative orientation between RNA polymerase I promoter and terminator sequence. Thus, transfection of the plasmid into eukaryotic cells yields negativesense vRNA (synthesised by RNA polymerase I) and positive-sense mRNA for protein expression (synthesised by RNA polymerase II) from one template. Consequently, cotransfection of separate protein expression plasmids is no longer necessary, thereby reducing the number of plasmids required for virus generation. The efficiency of virus generation in this system is comparable to that of the RNA polymerase I system, although the fact that both protein expression and vRNA synthesis are achieved from the same template reduces the flexibility of the system. For example, the RNA polymerase I/II system is not suitable for the formation of virus-like particles lacking or containing lethal mutations in one or more viral segments in studies of viral protein functions or gene delivery (see below). Nonetheless, both the RNA polymerase I and the RNA polymerase I/II systems provide excellent tools for numerous applications.

As follows from this citation, Neumann and Kawaoka consider the present invention a noteworthy "different route" as compared to the recombinant system disclosed in Neumann *et al.* article. Furthermore, they question the usefulness of the present invention with respect to some

Docket No.: 02427/100G772-US1 {W:\02427\100G772000\00294702.DOC \*02427\100G772000\* }

Group Art Unit: 1648

applications, which clearly reflects that they do not consider it an obvious variation of Neumann

et al.

The fact that the present invention constitutes a significant advance which by no means is

obvious in light of Neumann et al. is further emphasized in a recent article by de Wit et al.

(Virus Res., 2004, 103: 155-161; attached as Exhibit D) (emphasis added):

(p. 155, right col.)

Neumann et al. reported that upon co-expression of five additional plasmids encoding the hemagglutinin (HA), neuraminidase (NA), matrix proteins 1 and 2

(M1 and M2) and non-structural protein 2 (NS2), virus titers in the supernatants could be increased up to  $5x10^7$  pfu/ml. An elegant modification of these 12 and

17-plasmid systems came from Hoffmann et al. who implemented bidirectional vectors to reduce the number of transfected plasmids to eight. With this system,

the negative-stranded vRNA and the positive-stranded mRNA can be synthesized from the same plasmid and virus titers up to  $2x10^7$  were reported (Hoffmann et

al., 2000). The ability to produce recombinant influenza A virus rapidly and in

such high titers will greatly facilitate future influenza virus research.

(p. 160, left col., beginning of Discussion)

A bidirectional 8-plasmid transcription system that was first described for influenza virus A/WSN/33 (Hoffmann et al., 2000) was found to be superior to

our in-house unidirectional 12-plasmid transcription system. A large difference

was observed in the amount of virus produced from 293T cells transfected with

constructs encoding influenza virus A/PR/8/34 and A/WSN/33...

As further summarized in sections 16-17 of the Expert Opinion Declaration of Dr.

Webster and section 15 of the Expert Opinion Declaration of Dr. Webby, the dual pol I-pol II

promoter plasmid system of the present invention turned out to be not only much simpler and

more reproducible than the system of Neumann et al., because it significantly decreased the

number of plasmids for transfection and eliminated the need to adjust the relative amount of each

plasmid, but efficient as well. Efficiency of the plasmid system of the present invention is

17

Docket No.: 02427/100G772-US1

Filed: 04/27/2001

Group Art Unit: 1648

another unexpected benefit, especially in light of Neumann et al. demonstrating greater

efficiency with more plasmids.

Also, in contrast to the Neumann et al. system, which for a long time was capable of

efficiently producing infectious virus only in 293T cells, the dual pol I-pol II promoter system of

the present invention efficiently generated infectious viral particles in monkey Vero cells. This

is not a trivial difference. 293T cells are transformed cells that are not approved by WHO for

vaccine seed production. Vero cells are approved for vaccine seed production. Thus, at the time

of the present invention, the Neumann et al. system would have been regarded as not yet

practical. Nothing in Hoffmann's thesis indicates this particular characteristic of the dual pol I-

pol II promoter system.

Non-obviousness of the of the dual pol I-pol II promoter plasmid system of the present

invention is further demonstrated by its unmatched usefulness for the fast and easy generation of

influenza vaccines which addresses a raging need for rapid influenza vaccine response,

particularly with the expectation of a worldwide pandemic in the near term. As specified in

sections 17-18 of the Declaration of Dr. Webster and section 16 of the Declaration of Dr.

Webby, more and more investigators around the world are using the dual pol I-pol II promoter

reverse genetic system of the present invention to generate recombinant influenza vaccines. For

example, the use of the 8-plasmid dual pol I-pol II promoter system of the present invention

allowed researchers at St. Jude Children's Research Hospital to produce a vaccine to the deadly

avian H5N1 influenza virus A/Hong Kong/213/03, which caused human infections and lead to a

WHO pandemic alert on February 19, 2003. The vaccine was produced in Good Manufacturing

Practice (GMP)-grade facilities in less than 4 weeks from the time of virus isolation (see Webby

et al., Lancet, 2004, 363: 1099-103; attached as Exhibit E). The ability to produce a candidate

reference virus in such a short period of time has set a new standard for rapid response to

emerging infectious disease threats and has clearly demonstrated the superior usefulness of the

dual pol I-pol II promoter system of the present invention for influenza vaccine development.

18

Docket No.: 02427/100G772-US1

Filed: 04/27/2001

Group Art Unit: 1648

The same technologies and procedures are currently being used to create reference vaccine

viruses against the 2004 H5N1 viruses circulating in Asia.

In sum, neither the Hoffmann dissertation nor Neumann et al. article provide any

expectation of success or suggestion to be combined with the other reference. Even if forcibly

combined, Neumann et al. and the Hoffmann dissertation do not disclose or suggest modifying

the disclosed compositions to generate a set of dual promoter pol I-pol II plasmids for the

generation of infectious influenza viruses from cloned viral cDNA as recited in the present

claims.

In the Office Action, claim 45 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious

over Hoffmann and Neumann et al. and further in view of Pleshka et al. (J. Virol., 1996,

70:4188-92) who teach that ribozymes can be used to generate specific ends of influenza

segments. As specified above, even if combined, Neumann et al. and the Hoffmann dissertation

do not disclose or suggest the dual promoter pol I-pol II plasmid composition which generates

infectious influenza viruses from cloned viral cDNA as recited in claim 45. The knowledge of

the fact that ribozymes can be used to generate specific ends of influenza segments does not

provide any missing link which would allow one skilled in the art to arrive at the present

invention.

In light of the foregoing arguments, it is respectfully submitted that pending claims are

not obvious over the cited art. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the obviousness rejection is

believed to be in order.

**CONCLUSION** 

Applicants request entry of the foregoing amendments and remarks in the file history of

this application. In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that

claims 2-5, 7-17, 19-29, 32, 39, and 42-45 are now in condition for allowance and such action is

19

Docket No.: 02427/100G772-US1

Group Art Unit: 1648

earnestly solicited. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conversation would help advance the prosecution in this case, the Examiner is respectfully requested to call the undersigned agent at (212) 527-7634. The Examiner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees associated

with this response to our Deposit Account No. 04-0100.

Dated: November 5, 2004

Irina E. Vainberg, Ph.D.

Reg. No. 48,008
Agent for Applicant(s)

Respectfully submitted,

DARBY & DARBY, P.C.

DARBY & DARBY, P.C 805 Third Avenue New York, N.Y. 10022 Phone (212) 527-7700

IEV: